

SCANNED at MENARD and E-mailed
12-28-23 by RM 14 pages
Date Initials No.

WILLIE HALL VS. G.T.L ET.AL

1983

COMPLAINT

23-4054-DWD

THIS PLAINTIFF BRINGS THIS COMPLAINT AGAINST G.T.L, THE WARDEN OF MENARD C.C., ANTHONY WILLS, AND DIRECTOR LATOYA HUGHES FOR BREACHING CONTRACT, FALSE ADVERTISEMENT, DUE PROCESS VIOLATION, EQUAL PROTECTION VIOLATION, AND 1ST AMENDMENT, RIGHT TO EXERCISE RELIGIOUS, UNDER COLOR OF LAW.

THIS PLAINTIFF SEEKS MONEY DAMAGES & INJUNCTION RELIEF, AND WHAT EVER ELSE THIS COURT DEEMS PROPER & EQUITABLE.

THIS COMPLAINT WAS FILED ON 12/26/23, WHILE AT THE MENARD C.C. ADDRESS BELOW:
P.O BOX 1000, MENARD IL, 62259.

ALL DEFENDANTS ARE SUED IN THEIR OFFICIAL AND PERSONAL CAPACITIES AND IS ALL TIMES RELEVANT. LATOYA HUGHES BEING THE DIRECTOR OF I DOC, ANTHONY WILLS BEING THE WARDEN OF MENARD C.C. BOTH INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS KNOWINGLY SELLING TABLETS FOR G.T.L AND WELL AWARE OF THE VIOLATIONS THEY HAVE COMMITTED & CONTINUE TO COMMIT, AND G.T.L BEING THE PROVIDER & COMPANY, KNOWING THE VIOLATION I DOC CONTINUES TO COMMIT WHILE WHOLE BOGUSLY SALE THEIR TABLETS AND CONTINUE TO ALLOW THESE VIOLATIONS TO HAPPEN.

AFFIDAVIT

I CERTIFY THAT THIS AFFIDAVIT IS WRITTEN TO THE BEST OF MY ABILITY, TRUE & UNDER OATH
(BY I WILLIE HALL #8-13136)

THAT THIS PLAINTIFF WAS SOLD A DEFECTIVE TABLET BY THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS AND INFORMED THEM OF THE ISSUE WHICH THEY REFUSE TO FIX. THAT G.T.L ADVERTISES AROUND 40 APPS ON THE TABLET, AND THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS REMOVE THEM WITHOUT A PENALOGICAL JUSTIFICATION OR EXPLANATION. BUT DO NOT REMOVE THEM OR ALL OF THEM IN OTHER PRISONS OR PENAL INSTITUTIONS. RELIGIOUS BOOKS AND TEXTS ARE RESTRICTED, APPROPRIATE MUSIC, BOOKS, & EMOJIES ARE ALSO RESTRICTED. G.T.L ADVERTISE UNLITED BOOKS, & MUSIC ON THE TABLET WHICH IS NOT TRUE, AND THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS REMOVE WHATS ADVERTISED FOR NO PENALOGICAL JUSTIFICATION OR EXPLANATION. THAT CONTRACT BETWEEN I DOC & THE PLAINTIFF IS NOT MADE KNOWN TO THIS PLAINTIFF. THAT THIS PLAINTIFF FILED GRIEVANCE TO G.T.L CONCERNING THE VIOLATIONS MENTIONED HERE IN. THAT G.T.L GAVE THIS PLAINTIFF A RUN AROUND RESPONSE. THAT THE PLAINTIFFS COMPLAINT IS TRUE AND THE DEFENDANTS KNEW THAT THEY WERE VIOLATING THIS PLAINTIFFS RIGHTS MENTIONED IN HIS COMPLAINT. THAT G.T.L ALLOWED LATONYA HUGHES & ANTHONY WELLS TO VIOLATE THIS PLAINTIFFS RIGHTS AND ANTHONY WELLS CONTRACT WAS BOGUS.

WRITTEN BY I. WILLIE HALL

Jan 26

I CERTIFY THAT ON 12/26/23 I FILED THIS
AFFIDAVIT UNDER OATH

BRIEF

- 1.) THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS LATOYA HUGHES AND ANTHONY WILLS HAVE A CONTRACT WITH THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANT G.T.L. BESIDES THE FACT THAT THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS LATOYA HUGHES & ANTHONY WILLS SALE TABLETS FOR THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANT G.T.L, THE REST OF THEIR CONTRACT IS UNKNOWN AND NOT MADE AVAILABLE TO THIS PLAINTIFF.
- 2.) THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANT G.T.L ALSO HAS A CONTRACT WITH THIS PLAINTIFF AND ALL INDIVIDUALS WHO BUYS THEIR TABLET. WHICH IS SEEN ON THE TABLET. G.T.L ALSO ADVERTISE MANY FEATURES IN THE BODY OF THE TABLET SUCH AS, GUARANTING UNLIMITED MUSIC, UNLIMITED BOOKS, NEWS FEEDS, MOVIES, GAMES, AND IT ALSO ADVERTISES AROUND 30-40 APP'S ON THE TABLET. G.T.L ALSO FEATURES A SUPPORT APP. IN WHICH IS USED AS A COMPLAINT AVENUE TO G.T.L [REDACTED] WHICH IS ANSWERED BY G.T.L'S SUPPORT TECHNICIANS THIS IS USED TO GRIEVE ISSUES AND A SUPPORT TECHNICIAN WILL REPLY TO ALL ISSUES, CONCERN'S OR QUESTIONS. G.T.L ALSO HAS A SECTION ON THE TABLET CALLED AGREEMENTS. ON AGREEMENTS #13, B, A CALLED LIMITED PRODUCT WARRANTY FOR PURCHASED DEVISE WHICH STATES: G.T.L WARRANTS TO THE ORIGINAL PURCHASER OF THE PURCHASED DEVISE, THAT THE PURCHASED DEVISE SHALL BE FREE FROM DEFECT IN MATERIAL AND WORKMANSHIP UNDER NORMAL USE FOR A PERIOD OF (90) NINETY DAYS FROM THE DATE OF ACTIVATION OF YOUR PURCHASED DEVISE. (THE WARRANTY PERIOD). A PURCHASED DEVISE WILL BE DEEMED ACTIVATED THE FIRST TIME YOU LOG INTO THE PURCHASED DEVISE.
- 3.) THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS LATOYA HUGHES & ANTHONY WILLS ALSO HAVE A CONTRACT WITH PLAINTIFF AND ALL OTHER RESIDENTS/INMATES WHO PURCHASE THE TABLET SHE & ANTHONY WILLS SALE FOR G.T.L. A CONTRACT WHICH IS UNKNOWN & NOT MADE AVAILABLE TO THIS PLAINTIFF & CUSTOMER.
- 4.) THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS LATOYA HUGHES & ANTHONY WILLS ALSO HAVE PROCEDURES FOR WHEN AN INMATE/RESIDENT PURCHASES AN ITEM (ANYTHING FROM A COMPANY) THAT IS NOT ALLOWED IN THE PRISON. WHEN AN INMATE PURCHASES ANY ITEM FROM ANY COMPANY THAT IS NOT ALLOWED, THE INMATE/RESIDENT WILL BE ISSUED A 30 DAY CONFISCATION SHEET. THIS SHEET WILL SATISFY THE INMATE/RESIDENTS 14TH AMENDMENT DUE PROCESS CLAUSE BECAUSE, IT WILL ALLOW THE INDIVIDUAL RESIDENT TO KNOW THE FOLLOWING: 1., THE INDIVIDUAL HAS RECEIVED AN ITEM WHICH IS NOT PERMITTED IN THE FACILITY, AND THEN EXPLAIN WHY SAID ITEM IS NOT PERMITTED IN FACILITY. 2., AFTER THE INDIVIDUAL HAS BEEN NOTIFIED AS TO WHY THE ITEM(S) ARE NOT PERMITTED, HE/SHE WILL BE GIVEN (4) FOUR OPTIONS, #1 DESTROY THE ITEM, #2 SEND ITEM HOME, #3 HAVE ITEM PICKED UP AT THE FACILITY, OR #4 THE INDIVIDUAL CAN FILE A GRIEVANCE. IF A GRIEVANCE IS FILED, THE FACILITY WILL

HOLD THE ITEM UNTIL THE GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE IS COMPLETE. IF THE INDIVIDUAL STILL CAN NOT HAVE THE ITEM, HE/SHE WILL BE GIVEN 30 DAYS TO CHOOSE 1 OF THE 4 OPTIONS GIVEN. THIS PROCEDURE WILL SATISFY THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE. THIS PROCEDURE ~~██████████~~ APPLIES TO ANYTHING A RESIDENT HAVE THATS NOT PERMITTED OR NO LONGER PERMITTED, NOTHING IS JUST THROWN AWAY OR SENT HOME OR MADE TO BE PICKED UP. THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS HAVE PROCEDURES FOR SUCH MEASUREMENTS THAT MUST SATISFY AN INDIVIDUAL IN CUSTODY'S DUE PROCESS CLAUSE.

SPECIFICALLY

5.) THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS G.T.L REFUSE TO HONOR THEIR AGREEMENTS AND SOLD THIS PLAINTIFF A DEFECTIVE TABLET WHICH DID NOT FUNCTION PROPERLY. THE TABLET THE DEFENDANTS SOLD THIS PLAINTIFF WOULD NOT ALLOW HIM TO MAKE A PLAYLIST. ~~MADE~~ PLAYLIST IS A FUNCTION ON THE G.T.L TABLET THAT ALLOWS THE OWNER OF THE TABLET TO ADD & ORGANIZE MUSIC THAT HE/ SHE LIKES TO A PERSONAL PLAYLIST. YOU SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO MAKE UP TO 10 DIFFERENT PLAYLIST WITH UP TO 500 SONGS ON EACH PLAYLIST. THIS PLAINTIFF USED THE SUPPORT APP TO INFORM G.T.L ABOUT THE DEFECTIVE DEVICE. THIS PLAINTIFF INFORMED G.T.L THAT ~~HIS TABLET WAS~~ NOT LETTING HIM MAKE A PERSONAL PLAYLIST, AND ASK HOW COULD HE FIX THE PROBLEM. PLAINTIFF GOT A RESPONSE FROM SUPPORT TECH. ~~SAYING~~ THEY WOULD INVESTIGATE THE PROBLEM. AFTER A COUPLE OF WEEKS OF HEARING NOTHING ELSE FROM THE G.T.L SUPPORT TECH, THIS PLAINTIFF ASK THE SUPPORT TECH, IF G.T.L WAS TO REBOOT THE TABLET, WOULD THAT HELP THE PLAINTIFF BE ABLE TO MAKE A PLAYLIST? PLAINTIFF GOT NO RESPONSE BUT, PLAINTIFF'S TABLET WAS REBOOTTED. THIS PLAINTIFF'S TABLET WAS & STILL IS UNABLE TO MAKE PLAYLISTS.

6.) THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANT G.T.L ALSO HAD GUARANTEED UNLIMITED MUSIC. BUT, WHEN THIS PLAINTIFF TRYED TO LISTEN TO THE DESIRED MUSIC OF HIS CHOICE, CERTAIN MUSIC WAS NOT AVAILABLE. THE MUSIC COULDVE BEEN ANYTHING, SUCH AS LOVE SONGS, RAP SONGS, COUNTRY MUSIC, OR MUSIC FROM CERTAIN ARTIST. WHEN TRYING TO LISTEN TO A SONG THAT WAS NOT AVAILABLE, A MESSAGE WOULD APPEAR ON THE SCREEN THAT WOULD READ: AN ERROR WAS ENCOUNTERED WHILE TRYING TO RECEIVE DATA FROM THE RECEIVER. BUT THAT MESSAGE WAS NOT TRUE, THERE WAS NO ERROR. THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS DIDNT WANT TO SAY THAT THE SONG I WAS REQUESTING WAS NOT AVAILABLE BUT, THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANT DID INDEED GUARANTEE UNLIMITED MUSIC THUS, THEIR GUARANTEES WERE NOT TRUE.

7.) THE SAME APPLIED WITH THE GUARANTEE OF UNLIMITED BOOKS, WHEN I TRIED TO READ A BOOK FROM A DESIRED ARTIST, A MESSAGE WOULD COME ACROSS THE SCREEN THAT READ: AN ERROR WAS ENCOUNTERED WHILE TRYING TO RECEIVE DATA FROM THE SERVER. BUT, THERE WAS NO ERROR. THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS DID NOT WANT TO SAY THE BOOK REQUESTED IS NOT AVAILABLE. THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANT DID INDEED GUARANTEE TO UNLIMITED BOOKS, THUS THEIR GUARANTEE'S WERE NOT TRUE.

8.) SAME AS WITH EMOJI'S THAT ARE ADVERTISED ON THE TABLET, WHEN EVER THIS PLAINTIFF PRESSED AN EMOJI A MESSAGE WOULD COME ACROSS THE SCREEN THAT READ: AN ERROR WAS ENCOUNTERED WHILE TRYING TO RECEIVE DATA FROM THE SERVER. BUT, THERE WAS NO ERROR. THE DEFENDANTS JUST DID NOT WANT TO SAY THAT PLAINTIFF COULD NOT USE THE DESIRED EMOJI'S.

9.) THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS INFACt REMOVED ADVERTISED BOOKS, MUSIC, EMOJI'S (ETC) FOR NO PENALOGICAL JUSTIFICATION OR EXPLANATION AND SIMPLY JUST WOULD NOT ALLOW PLAINTIFF TO READ A CERTAIN BOOK OR LISTEN TO A CERTAIN SONG OR USE AN EMOJI. FOR EXAMPLE, THIS PLAINTIFF COULD NOT READ A GAME OF THRONES BOOK, OR A JAMES PATTERSON BOOK OFF THE TABLET ALTHOUGH THESE BOOKS ARE ON THE APPROVED BOOK LIST FOR IDOC AND SUCH BOOKS ARE PERMITTED IN MENARD C.C. & IDOC. SAME APPLIES TO MUSIC, WE CAN LISTEN TO A R-JAY SONG CALLED "ONE NIGHT" A LOVE SONG ON THE RADIO. OR WE CAN HAVE THE LYRICS SENT IN THROUGH THE MAIL BUT THE SONG IS DENIED ON THE TABLET BY THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS FOR PENALOGICAL JUSTIFICATION OR EXPLANATION. THIS LIST GOES ON & ON BOOKS, MUSIC, EMOJI'S ARE ALL OF WHICH ARE PERMITTED IN IDOC, ARE DENIED ON THE TABLET FOR NO PENALOGICAL JUSTIFICATION OR EXPLANATION.

10.) THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS LAToya HUGHES & ANTHONY WILLS, INFACt REMOVED 30 OF THE 40 APPS THATS ADVERTISED ON THE TABLET FOR NO PENALOGICAL JUSTIFICATION OR EXPLANATION AND THIS PLAINTIFF ARE NOT ABLE TO VIEW THE CONTENT OF THE REMOVED APPS AT ALL. THE DEFENDANTS LAToya HUGHES & ANTHONY WILLS ACTIONS WERE INTENTIONALLY DONE WITH NO PENALOGICAL JUSTIFICATION OR EXPLANATION.

COUNT I BREACHING CONTRACT

11.) DEFENDANTS G.T.L REFUSE TO HONOR CONTRACT & AGREEMENTS BY NOT FIXING PLAINTIFFS DISFUNCTIONAL TABLET

12.) DEFENDANTS BEING OBLIGATED TO GIVE THIS CUSTOMER & PLAINTIFF HIS MONEY BACK, EXCHANGE THE DEFECTIVE DEVISE OR FIX THE ~~DEFECTIVE~~ DEFECTIVE DEVISE REFUSED TO DO SO.

13.) DEFENDANTS KNEW THEY WERE VIOLATING THEIR OWN CONTRACT BY NOT FIXING THE DEFECTIVE TABLET WHEN MADE AWARE THAT PLAINTIFFS TABLET WAS DISFUNCTIONAL.

14.) THIS PLAINTIFF FILED A COMPLAINT WITH G.T.L USING THE G.T.L SUPPORT APP.

15.) INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS LATOYA HUGHES & ANTHONY WILLS REFUSE TO EVEN REVEAL THE CONTRACT BETWEEN THEM & THIS PLAINTIFF

16.) THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS WERE WELL AWARE OF THE VIOLATIONS MENTIONED HERE IN.

COUNT II FALSE ADVERTISING

- 17.) THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS G.T.L DISPLAY AND CLAIM TO GUARANTEE THAT THIS PLAINTIFF WOULD BE ABLE TO LISTEN TO UNLIMITED MUSIC, WHICH WAS NOT TRUE.
- 18.) THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS G.T.L DISPLAY AND CLAIM TO GUARANTEE THAT THIS PLAINTIFF WOULD BE ABLE TO READ UNLIMITED BOOKS WHICH WAS NOT TRUE.
- 19.) THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS G.T.L DISPLAY AND CLAIM TO GUARANTEE THAT THIS PLAINTIFF WOULD BE ABLE TO MAKE & USE 10 DIFFERENT PLAYLISTS, WHICH WAS NOT TRUE.
- 20.) THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS G.T.L DISPLAY AND ADVERTISE EMOJIES THAT THIS PLAINTIFF WAS RESTRICTED FROM USING.
- 21.) THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS G.T.L DISPLAY AND ADVERTISE PHONE APP, VIDEO APP, NEWS APP, APPROVED MOVIES, APPROVED GAMES (BY THE FACILITY) & COUNTLESS OF OTHER APPS THAT THIS PLAINTIFF WAS RESTRICTED FROM USING FOR PENALOGICAL JUSTIFICATION OR EXPLANATION.
- 22.) THE DEFENDANTS WERE ALL AWARE OF THE VIOLATIONS MENTIONED HERE IN.

COUNT III DUE PROCESS CLAUSE VIOLATION UNDER THE 14TH AMENDMENT

23.) THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS LATOYA HUGHES & ANTHONY WILLS RESTRICTED MUSIC OFF THE TABLET THEY SALE FOR GTL FOR NO PENALOGICAL JUSTIFICATION OR EXPLANATION.

24.) THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS LATOYA HUGHES & ANTHONY WILLS RESTRICTED BOOKS OFF THE TABLET THEY SALE FOR GTL FOR NO PENALOGICAL JUSTIFICATION OR EXPLANATION.

25.) THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS LATOYA HUGHES & ANTHONY WILLS RESTRICTED NEWS FEEDS, MOVIES, GAMES, EMOJIES, VIDEO APP, PHONE APP, AND 30 OTHER APPS THAT WERE FEATURED & ADVERTISED ON THE TABLET THEY SALE FOR GTL ~~WITH~~ WITH NO PENALOGICAL JUSTIFICATION OR EXPLANATION THUS PURPOSEFULLY VIOLATING THIS PLAINTIFF RIGHTS.

26.) THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS ACTIONS WERE MALICIOUS WANTON AND DONE WITHOUT NO PENALOGICAL JUSTIFICATION OR EXPLANATION.

27.) THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS ~~KNEW~~ THEY WERE VIOLATING THIS PLAINTIFFS RIGHTS AND WHATS MENTIONED HERE IN.

COUNT II EQUAL PROTECTION VIOLATION

- 28.) ALL INMATES/RESIDENTS SIMILARLY SITUATED SHALL BE TREATED ALIKE.
- 29.) THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS REMOVED APP'S OFF THE TABLET THEY SALE FOR GTL (TO THIS PLAINTIFF) FOR NO PENCILOGICAL JUSTIFICATION OR EXPLAINATION WHILE ALLOWING OTHER INMATES/RESIDENTS IN OTHER PRISONS & PENAL INSTITUTIONS ACCESS TO THE APPS THEY REFUSE & RESTRICT FROM THIS PLAINTIFF

BRIEF

THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANT LATOYA HUGHES ALLOW OTHER PRISONS & PENAL INSTITUTIONS TO USE ALL OF THE APPS ADVERTISED ON THE TABLET OR MOST OF THE APPS ADVERTISED ON THE TABLET WHILE DISCRIMINATING AGAINST THIS PLAINTIFF FOR PENALOGICAL JUSTIFICATION OR EXPLANATION ALTHOUGH THIS PLAINTIFF PAID FOR THE TABLET, AND EXPECTED WHAT WAS ADVERTISED.

THIS PLAINTIFF ALSO, HAS A RIGHT TO PRACTICE ANY RELIGION AND THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS RESTRICTED THE HOLY QURAN FOR NO PENALOGICAL JUSTIFICATION AND ALSO OTHER RELIGIOUS TEXT SUCH IS RESTRICTED FOR NO PENALOGICAL JUSTIFICATION OR EXPLANATION. THIS PLAINTIFF WANTS HIS TABLET TO BE USED AS EVIDENCE.

SPECIFICALLY

WHEN EVER THIS PLAINTIFF TRYED TO READ A HOLY QURAN OR HOLY KORAN IT WAS RESTRICTED, ALSO WHEN EVER THIS PLAINTIFF TRYED TO READ OTHER RELIGIOUS TEXT THEY WERE DENIED ACCESS

COUNT II RIGHT TO EXERCISE RELIGION

- 30.) THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS REMOVED & RESTRICTED THIS PLAINTIFF FROM READING THE HOLY QURAN, THE HOLY KURAN & OTHER RELIGIOUS TEXTS WITH NO PENALOGICAL JUSTIFICATION OR EXPLANATION.
- 31.) THIS PLAINTIFF HAS A CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO PRACTICE RELIGION.
- 32.) THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS REMOVED THE MENTIONED RELIGIOUS BOOKS WITH NO PENALOGICAL JUSTIFICATION OR EXPLANATION.
- 33.) THE DEFENDANTS KNEW THAT THEY WERE VIOLATING THIS PLAINTIFF'S RIGHTS.
- 34.) THESE RELIGIOUS BOOKS & TEXTS ARE PERMITTED INSIDE OF I DOC AND THIS PLAINTIFF PAID FOR A DEVISE THAT ALLOWED SUCH RELIGIOUS BOOKS BUT THE PLAINTIFF WAS DENIED ACCESS TO THESE ADVERTISED RELIGIOUS BOOKS.

RELIEF REQUESTED

- 1.) AWARD THIS PLAINTIFF \$450,000 IN DAMAGES.
- 2.) ALLOW THIS PLAINTIFF ACCESS TO ALL APPS ADVERTISED ON THE G.T.L TABLET.
- 3.) ALLOW THIS PLAINTIFF ACCESS TO UNLIMITED MUSIC & BOOKS AS ADVERTISED ON THE G.T.L TABLET.
- 4.) PLAINTIFF PRESERVE THE RIGHT TO USE HIS TABLET AS EVIDENCE.

G.T.L SUED FOR \$250,000
LAToya HUNTER SUED FOR \$100,000
ANTHONY WILLS SUED FOR \$100,000

DEMAND TRIAL YES

WILLIE HALL #8-1336
Junn Junn
P.O. Box 1000
MENARD IL,
62259

I CERTIFY THAT ON I WILLIE J. HALL, WHILE AT MENARD CORRECTIONAL CENTER MAILED OUT
THE COMPLAINT USING THE U.S.PS BARING POSTAGE.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I CERTIFY THAT ON 12/26/23 WHILE HOUSED AT MENARD C.C. I SENT THIS COMPLAINT TO THE LAW LIBRARY TO HAVE IT E-FILED TO THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT IN THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, USING THEIR E-FILE SYSTEM, AND THE FEDERAL COURT HOUSE.

WILLIE HALL #S-BBL

JKunz

P.O Box 1000

MENARD, IL

62254

12/26/23



12-28-23

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
prisoner.esl@ilsd.uscourts.gov

ELECTRONIC FILING COVER SHEET

Please complete this form and include it when submitting any type of document, letter, pleading, etc. to the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Illinois for review and filing.

Hall, Willie

Name

S13136

ID Number

Please answer questions as thoroughly as possible and circle yes or no where indicated.

1. Is this a new civil rights complaint or habeas corpus petition? Yes or No
If this is a habeas case, please circle the related statute: 28 U.S.C. 2241 or 28 U.S.C. 2254
2. Is this an Amended Complaint or an Amended Habeas Petition? Yes or No
If yes, please list case number: n/a
If yes, but you do not know the case number mark here: _____
3. Should this document be filed in a pending case? Yes or No
If yes, please list case number: n/a
If yes, but you do not know the case number mark here: _____
4. Please list the total number of pages being transmitted: 14
5. If multiple documents, please identify each document and the number of pages for each document. For example: Motion to Proceed In Forma Pauperis, 6 pages; Complaint, 28 pages.

	Name of Document	Number of Pages
- Complaint	_____	1
- Affidavit	_____	1
- Brief	_____	11
- Certificate of Service	_____	1

Please note that discovery requests and responses are NOT to be filed, and should be forwarded to the attorney(s) of record. Discovery materials sent to the Court will be returned unfiled.